


REMARKS

The present application was filed on April 1, 2004 with claims 1-22. In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner required restriction of claims 1-22 of the above-referenced application to one of the following groups of claims: claims 1-12 (Group I); and claims 13-22 (Group II).

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement. The Examiner argues that the flexible leadframe devices could be made by processes materially different from those in method claims 13 and 15. Applicants disagree, in that any such process would be covered by, and thus not materially different from, the method claims. Accordingly, Applicants assert that the restriction requirement is improper and should be withdrawn. Moreover, there would be no undue burden in prosecuting claims 1-22 together.

In the event the outstanding restriction requirement is not withdrawn, Applicants hereby elect with traverse the claims of Group I, i.e., claims 1-12, for prosecution on the merits, and hereby cancel without prejudice claims 13-22.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: July 11, 2005

Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547